

Narrative

Summary

The New York Library Association in partnership with Urban Librarians Unite and St. John's University is applying for a Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Grant in the Community Catalyst Category to hold a National Forum in the amount of \$110,525. The purpose of this forum is to consider the psychological impact and stress associated with working in urban public libraries and seek to create recommendations which could mitigate some of this trauma. A number of tools will be used to assess these challenges in the profession. There will be a survey which will be widely disseminated through professional channels and social media. There will be a series of five sets of focus groups which will take place in various locations across the country. The national forum will be structured on the hackathon model currently used in the civic data and coding communities. The hackathon model is often used to allow a wide group of people to work together to create a minimum viable product to solve a problem. In the context of this grant, the hackathon model will allow for diversity of both input from participants and output of work product driven by practitioners in urban public libraries. A project website will be created which will contain research tools, draft reports, focus group discussion guides, summaries, and project archives. As this research happens the project managers will be on the lookout for institutions interested in partnering for a second round of study.

Statement of Broad Need

"When the core of the work requires radical kindness and connection as it exposes workers to pain and suffering - as it does in our libraries - leaders must recognize the toll that takes and provide support. Self-care does not replace institutional care" Rebecca Miller, *School Library Journal*, August 27, 2019

Library workers of all kinds are increasingly being exposed to unhealthy and traumatic levels of stress as a result of their work. In many instances they regularly encounter high levels of poverty, need, addiction, homelessness, and potentially violence. As some library staff are getting training in overdose protocols others are engaging in mental health first aid and others are supporting social service workers in the library. They are having to deal with new best practices for infectious diseases, a pandemic, riots, and disasters. While librarians are being tested by increasingly complex social welfare information requests they are also being tasked with enforcing security in libraries. As public spaces open to all members of society these security responsibilities, even when shared with professional security support staff, can be extremely challenging. Librarians are often the first ones to respond to a security situation and are frequently the ones who are left managing the incident and any follow up or bans which may result from them. There have been a number of serious, even fatal assaults on staff in libraries. This combination of compassion and caution have increased stress and trauma on library workers of all types.

Library workers are on the front lines of social challenges. They frequently deal with the outcomes of poverty, abuse, and systemic racism. Librarians are there ready to help but those acts of helping can be trying on the library professional doing the work. Issues of addiction, homelessness, mental health illness, and other very serious societal problems are common occurrences in libraries across the United States. The issues and occurrences can cross over into criminal activity such as drug trafficking and theft. There can be problems with public intoxication and drug use leading to inappropriate behavior on behalf of library patrons. This has led

some libraries to develop a variety of protocols based on the drugs which people appear to have taken while they are waiting for emergency services to arrive. Librarians often find themselves engaged in very high stakes reference interactions around housing and employment. There are real threats of violence up to and inclusive of the murder of library staff members. Library workers are seeing patrons taken out of the library on ambulance gurneys, escorted out by parole officers, and having court supervised visits with family. Some library workers particularly library professionals of color and GLBTQ staff are subject to a variety of abuse from patrons which can escalate to the level of threat. Even below that threshold of verbal harassment can become a regular part of library work. There are few outlets for staff to have free and fair conversations about these kinds of experiences particularly in a profession which values a love of patrons so highly.

These stresses can lead to loss of motivation, burnout, anxiety, addiction, and depression in library workers. It is extremely hard for even the most motivated staff to think of new programming ideas when they are afraid for their personal safety or stressed because they haven't seen a homeless regular for a few days. Staff who develop a particular propensity for this kind of conflict librarianship often find themselves victims of high levels of stress even as their skills and effectiveness are at their peak. Highly empathic, intellectually curious, hard-working library professionals can see exceptional results in dire circumstances but the qualities which make them effective also expose them to increased risk of stress and trauma. These stressors are major contributors to people leaving public library work or at least leaving the frontlines where they may otherwise serve very effectively despite the trauma they have received there.

The library profession does a poor job of processing these experiences. There is a level of esprit de corp in place which sets these kinds of interactions as badges of honor in public library work. People who have dealt with high-conflict library situations are afforded a degree of respect for this work and rightly so. Unfortunately there is also a degree to which it has become an expected part of the work and as such is often treated as paying a sort of professional dues. It's highly problematic when the profession sees it as just part of the territory of public library work. There is very little talk about the genuine stress of library work and little understanding of the stress and trauma which is quickly becoming inherent in it. This study is focused on public libraries, large urban public libraries. It would be beneficial to the profession as a whole if there were wider conversations about what impacts stress and trauma have on all levels and areas of the profession.

Self-care comes up often in conversations around these issues. It is wonderful when people take better care of themselves and find habits and aids to their physical and mental health. While it is a positive thing to promote healthy habits to staff and workers it is unfair to ask them to shoulder the burden of care for trauma sustained at work. Shifting care onto workers only exacerbates stress for staff as now they face yet another challenge and responsibility, this time for their own mental health and well-being. How could libraries work to support staff with mental health support, meditation, yoga, gym memberships, and other benefits to promote health in the midst of potential trauma? Even without these kinds of investments how can libraries do a better job of making a space for these conversations both internally as well as across institutions.

Libraries have a responsibility to support staff who have been the victims of traumatic experiences at work and to seek out new ways to mitigate those stressors before they arrive. Library administration faces a variety of new challenges as they seek ways to redress some of this stress. What training can be utilized to help staff prepare in potentially unusual ways? What do other fields offer? How will these issues ultimately be played out in labor relations with union members and civil service? How can libraries find cost effective solutions to these issues and provide fair support to their staff? What guidance is there about having these discussions and where can people go to have them safely?

Urban public librarians have a particular exposure to unsafe and stressful working conditions due to the density of their populations and the levels of endemic poverty and institutional disparity on display in any city. While

all libraries certainly have the potential for high levels of stress and urban libraries are not alone in seeing high amounts of social as well as informational needs from their patrons this study focuses on urban libraries due to the volume of engagements that take place there and the prevalence of high conflict librarianship in some communities and branches. The study will attempt to address issues like burnout, stress, and trauma in the profession. Urban libraries are a great place to explore these issues as there is a rapid pace of transactions, a high number of staff, and a higher population density resulting in a higher number of high stress interactions as part of library service.

In further studies the tools, techniques, and recommendations developed throughout the course of this grant could be applied to other types of libraries in different communities. These could include other urban libraries including libraries of different size and in different parts of the country not represented in the first round of focus groups and symposiums. The study sample could be widened to include a greater variety of libraries by finding expertise in rural and suburban libraries to look at the stress and trauma in these libraries as well. Academic librarians face many of the same issues and stressors as well as a whole range of issues unique to their work. It would be fascinating to seek out partners to use the tools which are bench tested here to look at these issues in librarianship on college and university campuses.

There have been a number of violent attacks on library staff reported in recent years. This has led to a greater awareness of security in the profession but central recommendations or standards for security in the profession are hard to come by and rarely discussed. Library staff receive, at best, very little security training and typically the highest security professionals in large libraries come from outside libraries. What training can be offered to help library staff mitigate the stress of high need or high conflict patrons before those interactions take place? What tools can be provided to them to help them navigate those experiences when they happen, to resist burnout, and to remain safe when those interactions become difficult or dangerous?

Project Design

This project will examine the causes and outcomes of stress on library staff and examine how it impacts performance, career development, and library service. Input will be sought from a wide range of sources using a variety of tools. Three organizations have come together to work on this project. The lead agency is the New York Library Association, a state chapter of ALA with 4 full time staff, 7000+ members, and 7 affiliate organizations. NYLA represents the interests, education, and welfare of libraries and librarians across the Empire State. NYLA will be overseeing the grant, managing funds, and monitoring progress throughout. St John's University, a 150 year old Catholic university in Queens New York with an ALA accredited MSLIS program will provide scholarly oversight, access to an IRB where needed, and MSLIS candidates for the research fellowship. Urban Librarians Unite, an independent professional non-profit organization dedicated to urban librarians and librarianship will design and conduct the research as well as planning the national forum. ULU has been working for urban libraries and librarianship for over and a decade and its founders Lauren Comito and Christian Zabriskie are the 2020 Library Journal Librarian(s) of the Year. Urban Librarians Unite has an incredibly diverse board and has made a point of recruiting underrepresented voices to leadership throughout it's organizational life. It is also broadly representative of the profession with administrators and front line librarians, public librarians, branch managers, an academic librarian, and input from outside the profession as well. These organizations in partnership offer a unique synergy for this project. NYLA's stability, ULU's fluidity, and the research rigor of St John's University make for a compelling team to address this troubling issue.

Three research tools will be used in preparation for the national forum. These tools will be prepared with oversight from our academic partners at St. John's University. Faculty there will ensure rigor and best practices. If necessary St Johns will submit the survey and focus group questions to their IRB. There will be a widely

disseminated survey regarding trauma and public library work. Five focus groups will be convened to discuss the issues in cities in the South, the West, the Midwest, the Northeast, and California. Research fellows will conduct ongoing lit searches in response to topics raised. Finally a national forum will be convened to culminate the project and synthesize the information gathered with a goal of producing rudimentary prototype tools for measurement, policy & procedure recommendations as well as suggestions for further study.

There will be scholarly research input throughout the process through our partners at St. John's University. The tools used in this research including the survey, discussion topics for the focus groups, and followup interview materials will be produced with input and supervision from our academic research coordinators. They will also oversee any IRB review which may be needed for the survey or any of the invitation tools used in the focus groups. Students in the St. John's MSLIS program will be recruited for research fellows who can respond to research needs as they come up and help to maintain the project website and tabulate survey and focus group results. These research fellows will play a crucial role in the literature review where they will be responsible for much of the actual research. They will also do important work note taking and recording the national forum. A job description for research fellows is included in this application packet.

Phase 1 - Literature Review

Research fellows will engage in a literature search concurrent with the survey and focus groups. The goal of this will be to produce an extensive bibliography of relevant materials in the academic, professional, and popular press. The goal of this literature review will initially be to seek out information and research around trauma experienced by library staff as a result of library work. As a corollary to this research they will attempt to collect any report of violence in libraries or on library staff. One purpose of this research will be to attempt to determine if there has been a recent uptick in violence against library workers or if there has been violence for sometime which has not been reported in the larger national press. As new issues and questions come up the research fellows will continue to add to this bibliography. Some potential areas of research include union negotiations, employee assistance plans, and how other similar professions classify and deal with trauma.

Phase 2 - Survey

An initial survey will be used to gain a broad overview of the thinking of library professionals around trauma, and used to inform the focus group questions and hackathon products.

Method

The survey will be developed for widespread dissemination through the public library community. Staff at all levels including custodial, security, administration, clerical, and pages will be encouraged to take the survey for as wide a view of these issues as possible. This survey will be put up on a survey platform that people are widely comfortable with. It will attempt to ascertain if staff have experienced trauma as part of their work in a library, what kind of trauma it was, how frequently it occurred, if management/administration were made aware of it, if there was any follow up, if it changed the way that the survey taker worked, and what they did about it for themselves. Were they given time away from public service to decompress, were they given training in how to write incident reports? What do different staff consider traumatic? What levels of comfort and familiarity do they have with conflict? What impact does that make on their personal and professional lives? The survey will use a variety of question types including rating scales, multiple choice, short answer, and open ended questions.

Selection of Survey Participants

While stress exists in all levels and forms of librarianship this study is focused on large urban centers so urban public librarians will be particularly encouraged to respond to this survey. Other professionals will be encouraged to take the survey as a means of capturing the data but they will be filtered out by questions about

their professional background. The information from respondents outside the study set will be retained for background and to create a crude picture of the issue across the profession.

The large urban sample group corresponds with the special skills and background of the project members. ULU is particularly focused on frontline urban public librarianship, St. John's is in New York City with classroom space in Manhattan and a campus in Queens, and NYLA, while not an urban organization per se, has members in numerous large cities in the state of New York. The background of these organizations, particularly Urban Librarians Unite, is a key factor of getting high levels of access in these large urban systems. These three groups each have very high levels of credibility with staff at all levels which will be important as they explore difficult and confidential issues.

Survey Dissemination

Every effort will be made to disseminate the survey as widely as possible. The survey will be hosted on the project website (which will also archive the project and serve as a means of distribution, resource sharing, and feedback). The survey will be shared via the New York Library Association, St. John's University, and Urban Librarians Unite. Each of the three partner groups will use their reach to get the survey out as far as possible. Large library systems will be contacted to see if they would be willing to send it out to all staff. National, regional, and local library professional organizations will be contacted for support in spreading the word to get as large a cross section of this particular subset of the profession as possible. This outreach will include both formal organizations but also social media groups, listservs, and whatever library thought leaders can be brought on board.

Phase 3 - Focus Groups

A series of focus groups will follow and will be used as a way of getting deeper into the issues facing library workers around stress and trauma on the job. There will be five two day focus group visits with three groups per visit in locations across the United States where project leaders and researchers will go into the field and get feedback from practitioners. These will all be at large systems or groups of systems in large urban centers.

Method

Focus groups will consist of five to seven people. There will be two conveners to facilitate and guide the conversation and a person dedicated to recording notes. A site visit for the focus group will consist of three group conversations. The first will be composed of administrators, department heads, and regional management. These will be followed up by two groups of frontline staff from pages up to branch managers. Diverse perspectives will be encouraged in each group including having a mix of librarians, paraprofessionals, security staff, and custodial workers. These groups will also be cultivated with an eye to diversity of the race, orientation, gender, and background of the participants.

Each three hour long conversation will be focused on moving toward results and action. This is not meant to be a substitute for therapy or treatment of any trauma which staff may suffer from as a result of their work in libraries. This is meant to be a conversation about what could have helped based on their experiences, what they would have liked to see immediately after the incident, and what would be helpful for them now. There will be strict and clearly laid out rules about privacy in the group. There will be ground rules for the conversation which will include respecting the privacy and experience of fellow employees and a pledge of privacy for everyone who participates. The focus groups will be summarized prior to publication and distribution in the interest of protecting the anonymity of participants.

Conversations with administration will focus on policies and procedures around trauma and traumatic experiences in the workplace. There will be discussions of what is currently on the books, how situations have been handled in the past, how leadership would respond in an ideal world, and what is limiting them from

attaining those results in the responses they have had. Training and preparation will be an open ended conversation on a “what if” principle, if you could get anything what would it look like? These conversations should include the director, the head of branch services, and security leadership. Finance should also be represented as there will be discussions of potential cost and resource impacts for various responses to staff trauma. Personnel/Human Resources should be present as well for insight into sick leave policies, FMLA, and any benefits which may help staff which are not being utilized or applied to these issues.

Privacy Considerations

Observations, suggestions, and quotations will be collected as researchers take notes during focus groups. A summary will then be prepared of the conversation in order to ensure anonymity of participants. These summaries will then be used in the national forum as well as offered for public review and further study on the project website. This information as well as the survey results will be made available to the public for free in hopes that other scholars may find the information useful in discussions around urban public libraries, trauma, or library management.

Selection of Focus Group Sites and Participants

Libraries interested in participating in this study include Nashville (South), St. Louis (Midwest), Salt Lake City (West), Los Angeles (California), and the three New York City libraries (Northeast). The goal of these focus groups is to have meaningful conversations around these issues in as wide a geographic area as possible while still being in libraries and communities of similar size and type. It will be meaningful to see if there are regional differences or ways in which different states deal with some of these issues which generate alternative issues or results. What impact do open carry laws have on staff? Is there narco tourism? Has the library or community sustained recent disruption and if so are there any correlations to be made with things that happened at other systems and how they did or didn't respond to them?

This list of potential sites was curated with a focus on having wide geographic representation within the United States. There is potential for further study should these tools and techniques be effective. It would be interesting to seek out other geographic regions as well as encouraging scholars and partner orgs to look at these issues in the context of other types of libraries. Studying small and mid-sized cities could show if problems and/or solutions scale up or down.

Participants in the focus groups will be self selecting from within the institutions interested in hosting these conversations. Potential volunteers would be told about the study in advance and given information so they can make informed choices about participating or not. No staff will be compelled to be there for any reason. Time on the clock will be allowed for the focus groups and staff may be encouraged to participate openly and honestly and only if they wish to be part of the conversation. Administrators will be encouraged to participate up to and inclusive of the director in a focus group facilitated by another administrator from a different organization. Admin/Management will be interviewed in their own group at the beginning of the focus groups. The idea of having admin go first is to have it be clear to staff that nothing will “get back to” admin in the course of the conversations. At the same time admin will be afforded privacy and protection. We want all staff at every level to feel safe and be comfortable having open and frank conversations.

Results of Phase 1 - 3

Materials and findings from the focus groups, survey and literature review that can be released will be placed on the project website ahead of the symposium and all of it will be provided to symposium participants so they can be familiar with the background information prior to starting the hackathon process. All of this material and research will be distilled and utilized in the work of the National Forum which will be a three day hackathon to attack this problem and these issues.

Phase 4 - National Forum/Hackathon

The National Forum will be structured on the hackathon model currently used in the civic data and coding communities. The hackathon model is often used to allow a wide group of people to work together to create a minimum viable product to solve a problem. In the context of this grant, the model will allow for diversity of both input from participants and output of work product driven by practitioners in urban public libraries. The goal of the hackathon is to have prototypes/drafts of real solutions to the problem at the end of the event.

Method

The attendees of the hackathon will be broken up into groups of 6, and each group will be tasked with solving a problem over the course of the three day event. Each group will be assisted by an experienced moderator from within the library world who will be able to understand the conversation and keep the groups focused. These groups will be tasked with solving aspects of the problem as revealed by the research done previously in the course of the grant. In the case of this project participants will be creating recommendations for policies, training, procedures, and best practices to help staff. We will be looking out for common trends and difficulties which can be solved by similar solutions. The work process that the hackathon will follow is; Ideas and Designing, Prototyping, Testing (via Peer Review for these purposes), and Finalizing.

Preparation for the Hackathon

To help participants prepare for the forum, we will share the focus group and survey results on the project website. All participants will be added to a communication platform like slack in order to facilitate conversations and questions before the hackathon, and they will be asked to brainstorm some ideas for projects to be done during the forum in preparation for a pitch session on evening one.

Selection of participants and creation of groups

Thirty people will be recruited from across the country through the focus groups, the surveys, and people in the profession who organizers know to be engaged in this work. The work groups will be set up with a goal of creating diverse teams with people from a variety of backgrounds and power levels in libraries. There will be a conscious effort to mix up people from different racial backgrounds, orientations, jobs, and regional representation.

Schedule

Prior to the forum we will send out a survey to attendees to get feedback on their particular areas of interest in the project and work. We will also hold a video conference meeting with attendees to present research findings and share information collected prior to the forum, and research from the literature review, the surveys, and the focus groups will be collated into briefing documents for participants no less than one month prior to the forum.

Day 1 Preparations, Arrivals, and Team Building

Time	Activity
8:30am	Event and space setup
10:00am - 12:00pm	Meeting with facilitators: Briefing moderators on project findings to date with discussion of goals/methods/end results
12:00pm - 1:00pm	Lunch
1:30PM - 4:00PM	Arrivals and team building activities, followed by discussion of goals/methods/end results
4:00 - 6:00pm	Dinner Break

6:00pm	Late night pitch session
--------	--------------------------

Day 2 Work day

10AM - 5PM (or later if teams want to stay)

Time	Activity
10:00am - 11:00am	Overview of hackathon process/ introductions of teams and moderators
11:00am - 12:00pm	Ideas and work time - groups encouraged to develop own products tools, ideas, prototypes, drafts
12:00pm - 1:30pm	Lunch
1:30pm - 2:30pm	More work time
2:30pm - 3:00pm	Low grade physical/mental activity to break up work time and help process
3:00PM - 5:00PM	Revising and finalizing
5:00PM - 6:00PM	sharing and presenting revised work
Evening	informal social and conversation groups encouraged as well as extended time focusing on product development

Day 3 Polish & Present

9:00am - 1:30pm

Time	Activity
9:00am - 11:00am	Finalizing drafts and polishing work
11:00am - 1:00pm	Present products to the whole group
1:00pm	Closing

End products

The groups assigned to each problem will dictate the shape of the end product. The information gathered through the survey and focus groups will be used to create tools which can be tested in a second stage of the project. Results from the hackathon may include policy recommendations, communication tools, or ongoing groups for support and further discussion. Part of the hackathon will focus on imagining new tools so finding new products will be part of the process itself.

Risks

The hackathon model of group work carries with it inherent risks. There is the risk that one or more of the groups will not work well together, that one or more of the groups will not be able to complete an end product in the time allotted, or that one or more groups will need information that we do not have in order to move forward with their idea.

One or more of the groups not working well together

We will mitigate the risk of discord within a project group by assigning each group a strong moderator from the profession to help resolve conflict in a productive way and move the project forward to completion.

One or more of the groups will not be able to complete and end product in the time allotted

A hackathon is a fluid process and sometimes ideas don't pan out the way participants thought they might. That's ok, one often learns more from the failure of an idea than the completion of it. In this case we are mitigating this risk by having 5 groups, and 5 different ideas moving forward during the process. If one or more isn't finished, we can still use the work by posting the partially

completed project(s) to the project website . Regardless of completion status, the group projects have the potential to move this conversation in our profession forward in a substantive way.

One or more groups will need information that we do not have in order to move forward with their idea

We will be mitigating this risk by doing substantial pre-work in advance of the national forum. The focus groups, survey and research should provide ample information to add to the personal experiences and professional expertise of the participants, and by providing the research to the group ahead of the forum, we hope to give forum participants time to digest the information so that we can move forward in the hackathon process more easily.

Project Website

ULU will create and host a public website to act as an organizing tool and project repository during and after the project. The project website will be a space where information about the research project can be stored and shared with the profession. In addition to hosting information about the project as a whole. Such as an about page, we plan to use the project website for three main purposes, engagement with the profession, organizational & travel information for the forum, and repository for the research findings.

To meet the need for engagement with the profession the site will be used to distribute the survey and act as a host for the forum recruitment application. We plan to use the site to host the survey form, and will direct interested staff to the site in order to fill the survey out. In addition we will make the call for forum volunteers available on the website, and encourage people who take the survey to apply to attend the national forum.

We will also use the project website as a place for forum participants to find organizational and travel information for the forum, including travel suggestions and hotel information. The website will also hold the agenda for the hackathon and an explanation of the process for participants.

As a repository for project data and the products that come out of the hackathon the website will host tools like the survey, focus group questions, discussion methods, and literature review results for public review. We also hope to provide information about the libraries/municipalities which are participating in the focus groups as well as basic demographic information for each of them. We plan to update the website with research findings as we complete each phase of the project, and will host the final report on the project website, likely as a pdf. The website will be maintained for at least a year after the end of the project.

Report

The final report for the project will primarily consist of a summary of the findings of all three research branches, the survey, the focus groups, and the lit search, as well as recommendations and project leads from the hackathon. It will detail the process, highlight successes and draw attention to areas where the research could have gone better or tools improved for future use. A timeline will be included which will include both the planned and actual schedules. There will be reports for each focus group detailing highlights and prevailing themes. The results of the survey will be reported and parsed with a variety of data visualizations to assist readers. A short annotated bibliography will be included with a summary of the larger bibliography assembled by the lit search. Finally there will be a report on the hackathon. There will be a summary of events, a list of participants, a record of the project instructions, and project summaries and notes for each of the five groups. Where groups were able to create a viable product they will be included as appendices. This report will be available widely as a pdf and in limited numbers of printed copies. It will be available for free from the project website as well as from the websites of St. John's, ULU, and NYLA.

National Forum Evaluation

Participants in the national forum will be given a survey at the end of the hackathon to respond with how they have come to understand these issues and look at how the process was effective or not in its search for answers. The findings and products of the national forum will be disseminated widely and given the popularity of the issue and the level of dialog that is already going on around it there will be plenty of opportunities to get feedback from the profession. There will also be a survey that will go back to the focus group participants asking both about the process and about any further thoughts or insights which they may have to share. Finally there will be a large after action conversation between the three participating groups to discuss how the event went, how it could have been improved, and what processes can be taken away for use in another similar study.

Diversity Plan

Urban public libraries serve and in many cases are staffed by diverse populations. Minority members of the profession are often disproportionately subject to abuse from the public as well and this often leads to hidden stressors which make retention of diverse professionals that much more difficult. In order to ensure that those voices are represented and that their needs are considered in our research and results we plan to focus on recruiting participants in our survey, focus groups, and for the forum from marginalized populations. We will be actively looking for representation from librarians and library staff of color, neurodiverse makeup, sexual orientation, and gender expression. Special efforts will be made to recruit diverse candidates for the research fellows and there will be diverse moderators to facilitate the national forum where it will be especially important that underrepresented voices have equal weight.

Broad Impact

Library staff are facing new and increasing stressors and trauma. From the panic of a pandemic to the cool categorization of overdoses the trauma of library work is not going away. This study scratches the surface and starts looking at the cause of this trauma, its impact, and possible ways of mitigating it. Even if no tools are actually produced this deep dive into librarian trauma will be an important effort to start to study a trend that is growing. Library staff across the country regularly experience severe stress and trauma as part of their work. It is essential to the future of the profession that efforts are made to address this. These stresses and the unhealthy ways in which they are handled cause burnout and professional fatigue.

The research collected in this process and the prototypes which are the result of the national forum will be widely available. Other scholars will be able to review as much of this raw material as privacy will allow and make their own suggestions and conclusions. Participants will be encouraged to publish and present on their experience and findings in the wider library professional world.

New York Library Association/Urban Librarians Unite/St. John's University
Project Name: Recognizing, Measuring, and Mitigating the Trauma of Urban Public Library Work
Application Number: RE-245044-OLS

Schedule Of Completion

Project Schedule - 18 months		Month																		
Activities	2020					2021													2022	
	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan		
Begin grant activities	█																			
Draft and launch website		█	█																	
Recruit and onboard fellow	█					█							█							
Evaluate fellow					█					█									█	
Draft survey		█																		
Distribute survey			█	█																
Survey due					█															
Tabulate survey results						█														
Schedule focus groups							█	█												
Draft focus group questions								█												
Hold focus groups									█	█										
Compile focus group results											█									
Distribute application for forum										█	█									
Select forum participants											█									
Confirm location arrangements for forum									█											
Arrange travel and lodging for forum participants											█	█								
Create and finalize hackathon schedule + plan										█	█	█								
Send research to forum attendees													█							
Hold Forum*														█						
Collect Evaluations															█					
Draft Final Report																█	█			
Distribute Project Reports																	█	█	█	

* We are scheduling the Forum for September 2021 to address the risk of COVID-19. We hope that gatherings the size of our forum will be permitted again at that time.



DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to digital products that are created using federal funds. This includes (1) digitized and born-digital content, resources, or assets; (2) software; and (3) research data (see below for more specific examples). Excluded are preliminary analyses, drafts of papers, plans for future research, peer-review assessments, and communications with colleagues.

The digital products you create with IMLS funding require effective stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and reuse by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

INSTRUCTIONS

If you propose to create digital products in the course of your IMLS-funded project, you must first provide answers to the questions in **SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS**. Then consider which of the following types of digital products you will create in your project, and complete each section of the form that is applicable.

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

Complete this section if your project will create digital content, resources, or assets. These include both digitized and born-digital products created by individuals, project teams, or through community gatherings during your project. Examples include, but are not limited to, still images, audio files, moving images, microfilm, object inventories, object catalogs, artworks, books, posters, curricula, field books, maps, notebooks, scientific labels, metadata schema, charts, tables, drawings, workflows, and teacher toolkits. Your project may involve making these materials available through public or access-controlled websites, kiosks, or live or recorded programs.

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

Complete this section if your project will create software, including any source code, algorithms, applications, and digital tools plus the accompanying documentation created by you during your project.

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

Complete this section if your project will create research data, including recorded factual information and supporting documentation, commonly accepted as relevant to validating research findings and to supporting scholarly publications.

SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS

A.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for developing or creating digital products to release these files under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, or assets; software; research data) you intend to create? What ownership rights will your organization assert over the files you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on their access and use? Who will hold the copyright(s)? Explain and justify your licensing selections. Identify and explain the license under which you will release the files (e.g., a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, Creative Commons licenses; RightsStatements.org statements). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access, and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions.

A.2 What ownership rights will your organization assert over the new digital products and what conditions will you impose on access and use? Explain and justify any terms of access and conditions of use and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms or conditions.

A.3 If you will create any products that may involve privacy concerns, require obtaining permissions or rights, or raise any cultural sensitivities, describe the issues and how you plan to address them.

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

A.1 Describe the digital content, resources, or assets you will create or collect, the quantities of each type, and the format(s) you will use.

A.2 List the equipment, software, and supplies that you will use to create the digital content, resources, or assets, or the name of the service provider that will perform the work.

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG, OBJ, DOC, PDF) you plan to use. If digitizing content, describe the quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, pixel dimensions) you will use for the files you will create.

Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

B.1 Describe your quality control plan. How will you monitor and evaluate your workflow and products?

B.2 Describe your plan for preserving and maintaining digital assets during and after the award period. Your plan should address storage systems, shared repositories, technical documentation, migration planning, and commitment of organizational funding for these purposes. Please note: You may charge the federal award before closeout for the costs of publication or sharing of research results if the costs are not incurred during the period of performance of the federal award (see 2 C.F.R. § 200.461).

Metadata

C.1 Describe how you will produce any and all technical, descriptive, administrative, or preservation metadata or linked data. Specify which standards or data models you will use for the metadata structure (e.g., RDF, BIBFRAME, Dublin Core, Encoded Archival Description, PBCore, PREMIS) and metadata content (e.g., thesauri).

C.2 Explain your strategy for preserving and maintaining metadata created or collected during and after the award period of performance.

C.3 Explain what metadata sharing and/or other strategies you will use to facilitate widespread discovery and use of the digital content, resources, or assets created during your project (e.g., an API [Application Programming Interface], contributions to a digital platform, or other ways you might enable batch queries and retrieval of metadata).

Access and Use

D.1 Describe how you will make the digital content, resources, or assets available to the public. Include details such as the delivery strategy (e.g., openly available online, available to specified audiences) and underlying hardware/software platforms and infrastructure (e.g., specific digital repository software or leased services, accessibility via standard web browsers, requirements for special software tools in order to use the content, delivery enabled by IIIF specifications).

D.2. Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Universal Resource Locator), DOI (Digital Object Identifier), or other persistent identifier for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

General Information

A.1 Describe the software you intend to create, including a summary of the major functions it will perform and the intended primary audience(s) it will serve.

A.2 List other existing software that wholly or partially performs the same or similar functions, and explain how the software you intend to create is different, and justify why those differences are significant and necessary.

Technical Information

B.1 List the programming languages, platforms, frameworks, software, or other applications you will use to create your software and explain why you chose them.

B.2 Describe how the software you intend to create will extend or interoperate with relevant existing software.

B.3 Describe any underlying additional software or system dependencies necessary to run the software you intend to create.

B.4 Describe the processes you will use for development, documentation, and for maintaining and updating documentation for users of the software.

B.5 Provide the name(s), URL(s), and/or code repository locations for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

Access and Use

C.1 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users.

C.2 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop:

Name of publicly accessible source code repository:

URL:

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

As part of the federal government's commitment to increase access to federally funded research data, Section IV represents the Data Management Plan (DMP) for research proposals and should reflect data management, dissemination, and preservation best practices in the applicant's area of research appropriate to the data that the project will generate.

A.1 Identify the type(s) of data you plan to collect or generate, and the purpose or intended use(s) to which you expect them to be put. Describe the method(s) you will use, the proposed scope and scale, and the approximate dates or intervals at which you will collect or generate data.

A.2 Does the proposed data collection or research activity require approval by any internal review panel or institutional review board (IRB)? If so, has the proposed research activity been approved? If not, what is your plan for securing approval?

A.3 Will you collect any sensitive information? This may include personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information. If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect the information while you prepare it for public release (e.g., anonymizing individual identifiers, data aggregation). If the data will not be released publicly, explain why the data cannot be shared due to the protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, and other rights or requirements.

A.4 What technical (hardware and/or software) requirements or dependencies would be necessary for understanding retrieving, displaying, processing, or otherwise reusing the data?

A.5 What documentation (e.g., consent agreements, data documentation, codebooks, metadata, and analytical and procedural information) will you capture or create along with the data? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the data it describes to enable future reuse?

A.6 What is your plan for managing, disseminating, and preserving data after the completion of the award-funded project?

A.7 Identify where you will deposit the data:

Name of repository:

URL:

A.8 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?